

E 340

.J3 J3

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00005082857







LETTER
OF
LEONARD JARVIS

TO
His Constituents

OF THE
HANCOCK AND WASHINGTON DISTRICT,

IN
Maine.

25.10
5335

E340
J3J2

TO MY CONSTITUENTS.

FELLOW CITIZENS: A pamphlet has been forwarded to me, from Maine, bearing the signature of Francis O. J. Smith, and addressed to you, for the double purpose of vindicating his own conduct, and doing me injury.

That this person should abstain from the publication of his pamphlet, until I was absent from home, in the discharge of my duty, as your representative, when he knew that the various trusts, public and private, which were confided to me, would necessarily prevent my giving a prompt reply, is worthy of the source from which the attack is made. I shall endeavor to be brief; for I have not leisure to make a long answer—indeed, from a cursory perusal of Mr Smith's performance, I should deem it an insult to your discernment, were I to give it an extended notice.

What is the reason which this Mr Smith gives for addressing you, and for making an attack upon your representative? It seems that an article has appeared in the *St. Croix Courier*, printed at *Calais*, in which Mr Smith is assailed for having written letters into my district, for the purpose of defeating my election. With his usual recklessness of assertion, he charges me with being the author, speaks of the printer of the *St. Croix Courier*, as my instrument, and makes this his excuse for assailing me. The pretext is without the least foundation. I did not write the article in question—I did not cause it to be written. Up to the present time I have not seen it; and I did not even know of its existence, until the fact was mentioned to me by one of my colleagues. As for Mr Bates, who is the printer, and for aught I know, the editor of the *St Croix Courier*, I never wrote

to him—I have never received a letter from him, and I do not recollect ever being in the same room with him, but once, and then certainly for not more than ten minutes. It seems, however, that Mr Bates and Mr Smith have been on terms of intimacy; and, after the specimens of their correspondence, furnished by Mr Smith, I leave you to decide whether he derives any honor from his share of it.—My concern, however, is not with Mr Bates, but with Mr Smith, and I will not permit him to escape upon a collateral issue.

To the charge of having unwarrantably interfered in the election of your representative, by writing letters to the editor of a newspaper, and others, in your district, in which unfounded charges were made against the regularly nominated candidate of the democratic party, of which Mr Smith professes to be a member, he replies that the letter he wrote was a private letter, and was not intended for publication, or to interfere in Mr Jarvis' election. I grant that the letter was not intended for publication, because its publication would have rendered it harmless. The foul calumnies it contained would have been refuted as soon as known, and an universal burst of indignation would have overwhelmed the calumniator. No! The poison was intended to work secretly—the mischief was to be done stealthily—the blow was to have been the blow of the assassin, aimed at the back, and struck in the dark. But the claim upon your credulity is too great, when Mr Smith requires you to believe that his purpose was not to defeat my election, provided it could be effected secretly. No one can read his letter without being satisfied that this was his object. It would be monstrous to believe that he could give utterance to such calumnies, without any motive.

I have said that his assertions are calumnies, and I proceed to the proof. He asserts, that “he,” (Mr Jarvis) “at Washington, was the most unpopular and despised man in the ranks of the administration party: in fact he was too odd and offish ever to be depended upon in case of real necessity.”

To meet this charge, it might be sufficient to refer to my votes, during the period that I have represented you in Congress, and to my associations in Washington. I might be content to appeal to the journals of the House of Representatives, and to challenge scrutiny;

but for the purpose of putting an indelible stigma upon Mr Smith, I will also appeal to the testimony of honorable men, whose characters Mr Smith may regard with envy, but to whose elevation he can never expect to attain. I appeal to Judge Wayne, to Mr Cambreleng, to Mr Shepley, to Capt. McIntire, to Col. Parks, to Mr Kavanaugh; and I am bold to say, that, were it necessary, I could increase the list by the testimony of all the respectable men of both parties: but you will doubtless consider the letters to which I now invoke your attention, as more than sufficient for the purpose for which they are laid before you;

Copy of a letter from the Hon. C. C. Cambreleng, to Leonard Jarvis, dated Washington, 8 Dec. 1834:

Dear Sir:

I have understood that during your late election, a malevolent attack was made upon your political character, and your standing as a member of the house. During the term which I have had the pleasure to serve with you in Congress, I have known no member more attentive than yourself to the duties of a representative, more faithful to sound democratic principles, or more firm in encountering the responsibilities incidental to public life. No one acquainted with your extensive information, your indefatigable industry, in making it useful to the house, and your manly course as a member of that body could doubt the respectability of your standing.

Copy of a letter from the Hon. James M. Wayne, to Leonard Jarvis dated House of Representatives, Dec. 13, 1834:

Dear Sir:

I have received your letter, and reply to it very cheerfully. The attack made upon you in a letter which you say was sent into your district a short time before the election, I have read with disgust. It is altogether wanting in decency and truth.

Since I became acquainted with you, which was during the first session you served in Congress, I have been the witness of your course—it has been independent, decisive, free from selfishness, democratic; nor can I call to mind any instance, and we have had

many tests, where our principles were to be applied in an enlightened support of the administration, in which you ever wavered or were absent from your post. I believe you have the respect and confidence of the party, as you certainly have mine.

Extract of a letter from the Hon. Ether Shepley, dated, Saco, August 29th, 1834:

I had a good opportunity to know your estimation and conduct as a member of Congress during the last session, and am gratified in being able to say, that it was such as to entitle you to the respect and confidence of your district, and to the cordial support of all your political friends, which I hope and trust will be cheerfully and unitedly given to you.

Extract of a letter from the Hon. Rufus McIntire, dated Parsonsfield, August 30, 1834:

Having spent four Winters in Washington with Mr Jarvis one of which was in the same Mess, I think I have some opportunity of knowing his standing there. I never before heard that he was despised by any body. His appointment on the important standing committees of Commerce and Foreign Affairs, as well as the several special committees of which he has been chairman is a better intimation of his standing in the House of Representatives and more to be relied on than any statement I could make.

During all the time he has been in Congress, I have never heard him numbered among the doubtful who could not be depended on in any test question of Administration policy. The Journals will show his votes, and I am not aware but they will compare with those of other firm friends of the Administration; they will I think shew the injustice of any private suspicions of a want of political integrity and consistency if any such have been entertained.

Extract of a letter from the Hon. Gorham Parks, dated August 1834:

Dear Sir,

I received your note and the accompanying extract, yesterday evening. I haste to answer it. Your standing, last winter, at Washington, both as a man and a politician, was honorable to you, and complimentary to the state and district which you represented. Your associates and friends were the leading friends of the administration, in both branches of Congress; your support of the administration was never questionable or doubtful.

Extract of a letter from the Hon. Edw. Kavanagh, dated Damariscotta Mills, Aug. 30th 1834:

Your valuable services in Congress, commencing with the first year of President Jackson's administration, have given you the confidence of the functionaries of the government, and of its prominent friends in the national legislature, while your known assiduity and talent in the discharge of all the duties to the people of your district need no voucher from any of your colleagues.

Such is the opinion entertained by these gentlemen of my party relations, and of my standing in Congress. After the perusal, what must be your opinion, my fellow-citizens, of Mr Smith and of his assertions?

Another charge made by Mr Smith, is, that "he," (Mr Jarvis) "is the suppliant tool of the Ware faction here, on all occasions, and there is no point of dishonorable conduct too low for him to descend to serve them."

By the "Ware faction," it is presumed, that Mr Smith proposes to designate those gentlemen of the democratic party in Portland, who had not sufficient confidence in his honor and integrity as a man, or in his faithfulness as a politician, to give him their suffrage. Of these there are several whom, I confess, that I do esteem most highly; and I trust that I shall always cherish the friendship of such men as General Chandler, Judge Preble, Judge Ware, and Mr Mitchell. I am glad of this public opportunity to declare myself their friend.—

I have known them long and intimately, and I know them to be men of high character and unblemished reputation. of whom the democracy of our country may be proud. But, of their whole course, with regard to our state elections, I have not approved, and I have not been backward in making my disapprobation known to them. I might ask them indeed, whether, in some instances, I have not urged the frankness of remonstrance to excess, and I cannot doubt what would be their answer. Several of my colleagues, however, are acquainted with my course and to them I appeal.

Their testimony on this point is as follows:

Extract of a letter from the Hon. Ether Shepley dated Saco, August 29, 1834:

My dear Sir:

It is with surprise and regret that I learn by your letter of the 22d that efforts are making to disparage you and prevent your election, by representing you as a "despised man in the ranks of the administration party," and as not to be depended upon in case of real necessity "and as the suppliant tool of the Ware faction."

The fact of your appointment upon the committee of foreign relations, and of the other trusts reposed in you by the administration Party of the House, are a sufficient refutation of the first allegation. Your recorded votes in the House during the last agitated session are a full answer to the second charge. To the last it is enough for all who know you to say, that it is impossible that you can be the suppliant tool of any man or set of men on earth, that surely is not a weak point in your character.

Extract of a letter from the Hon. Rufus McIntire, dated Parsonsfield August 30, 1834:

Instead of being the suppliant tool of Ware, &c., I believe so far as I could judge, and I had much opportunity to judge, that no man was or could be more frank than you were, last winter, in your correspondence with Judge Ware and his friends or could in more plain terms expostulate with him and them on their course.

Extract of a letter from the Hon. Gorham Parks, dated August, 1834.

I know that you openly, as well as privately, disapproved of very much of the conduct of the 'Ware faction,' & that in a correspondence with the Editor of the Jeffersonian "you laboured hard and as I thought eloquently, and efficiently, to point out the errors of their course, and to persuade them to support Gen. Dunlap and the other candidates of the Administration; and instead of being their "suppliant tool," you with boldness and energy, denounced their conduct where you thought it wrong. As to your being guilty of dishonorable conduct it cannot be necessary to deny it at home: I can only say, it would not be credited at Washington.

Extract of a letter from the Hon. Edward Kavanagh dated Damariscotta Mills, August 30, 1834:

It is true I believe that for some of the deserters from the Republican Party in Cumberland, at the last election, you had entertained personal friendship, but in all occasions I have heard you reprobate in severe terms of condemnation their refusal to sustain the regular Republican nominations in that District, and you have have avowed your readiness in common with the great body of the Republican party, to mark so far as it might be in your power, your sense of the impolicy and injustice of a course calculated to create and perpetuate divisions, fatal to the great cause for which we are contending.

Fellow citizens—Can more be wanting to satisfy you of the regard in which truth and fair dealing are holden by Mr Smith!

In order to divert your attention, from his unwarrantable interference, in the concerns of our district, and from the unfounded charges which he clandestinely urged against me, Mr Smith has deemed it advisable to publish a correspondence, very long on his part, and very brief on mine, which passed between us last winter. If he thinks to derive any honor from this publication, I do not feel disposed to disturb his self complacency, but I will give it a passing notice, in order that this fresh attempt of his to deceive you may be unmasked. To this man I owe no explanation, nor will I give him any, for I hold him unworthy of notice; but I address myself to you

in order that you may be satisfied, that, in this matter, as well as in the interference in our local concerns. Mr Smith has placed himself in a very unenviable predicament.

Mr Smith, in a very long note, which it might not be a great lack of courtesy to characterise as impertinent, charges me with having taken the "extraordinary liberty" of making known to a friend in Maine, that there was, on the files of the Post Office department, a letter from Gov. Dunlap to Smith, which was strictly confidential in its nature, and on this he founds a complaint that I have been guilty of a breach of confidence. Whether I did or did not make this communication is a matter of perfect indifference. I had a right so to do, if I thought proper, and it is a liberty which if I had felt disposed I should certainly have taken without asking permission of Mr Smith.—What are the facts? This Mr Smith, from personal enmity, and private interest, was determined, if possible, to procure the removal of the Post Master of Portland, and to give this lucrative office to the printer of a newspaper of which Smith was editor, and in which it was understood that they were jointly concerned: to effect this, he resorted to expedients which were not of the most creditable character, and so eager was he to accomplish his purpose, that he communicated to the Post Office department a letter from Gov. Dunlap, of the most confidential nature—a letter that was intended for no mortal eye, but that of Smith. This letter I myself saw upon the files of the Post Office department, exposed to the gaze of every member of Congress, who might feel any interest or curiosity in examining the papers; for it is customary to exhibit them to the members when required, and there was nothing to distinguish this case from any other. The papers were not only seen by me, but by others; and if this letter had come to the knowledge of those members of Congress from Maine, who were unfriendly to the administration, it might have been used to our detriment in our annual elections. I observed to the assistant Post Master General, that this was a singular letter to be made public by Mr Smith, and I lost no time in communicating the fact to Mr Shepley, in order that he might use his influence with Smith to have the letter withdrawn. Mr Smith thinks that in "the spirit of friendship, in some of our frequent and daily interviews," I ought "to have communicated with him in re-

lation to it." I must protest against any such obligation. I was not in the habit of having frequent and daily interviews with Mr Smith, and there was nothing to authorise him to expect any particular friendship on my part. My intercourse with him was confined to what common courtesy required of me, towards a colleague; and I never felt the slightest inclination to overstep this mark. I thought, however, that it was expedient to have the letter withdrawn, and I therefore instantly communicated the fact of this notorious breach of confidence, on the part of Smith, to Mr Shepley, in order that he might, if he thought proper, admonish Mr Smith of the impropriety of making public a confidential letter, and of the necessity of withdrawing one of which the promulgation would have an injurious tendency on our political concerns at home. I understand that Mr Shepley did so, and that the letter was withdrawn. The incipient mischief was thus arrested, and the fact of Gov. Dunlap's interference in the affairs of the Portland Post Office, and of Mr Smith's violation of confidence, would not have been spread abroad, had it not been for the strange infatuation of Mr Smith in divulging his own shame by his late publication.

If in addition to the information given to Mr Shepley, I had also imparted the fact to a friend, in the Legislature of Maine, or had even warned Governor Dunlap himself of the violation, on the part of his correspondent of what among men of honor has always been deemed most sacred, I ask you, with what propriety could Mr Smith charge me with having done aught that I had not the most perfect right to do? A letter ceases to be confidential when printed, or otherwise made public, and I certainly should have been justified in taking either or both of the courses to which I have alluded.

Mr Smith says that there was a letter of Mr Mitchell on file, marked "confidential;" and that he "kept his hands and his eyes turned far from it," because he "scorned an act of meanness marked with dishonor!" Does Mr Smith really believe that there is any one who will give him credit for such exquisite delicacy? a protestation, like this, would lead those, who knew him not, to have doubts of him and would curl with the sneer of derision the lips of those who knew him best. But there was not a word communicated by Mr

Mitchell to the department which might not be made public, without injury to him or to his cause. I wish I could say as much for the various documents which Mr Smith has not deemed it unworthy and disgraceful to use in order to effect his purpose.

Mr Smith, in the latter part of his first note to me, complains of my reading a letter which was given into my hands by accident, and which I knew was not intended for my perusal. But of this he says he "should not have complained because of the indifferent character of the letter if had I not given a partial and improper description of its contents to Judge Preble, and perhaps to others." It is not true that I misrepresented the contents of the letter; and the other cause of complaint is equally unfounded. The letter in question I have reason to believe was shewn to me through mistake; but I became acquainted with its contents before I knew that it was not intended for my perusal. The only question that remains is, whether having thus without impropriety, on my part, become acquainted with the contents of the letter, I was bound to keep them secret? Mr Smith says they were "very indifferent;" I agree with him entirely, in this in one sense of the word *indifferent* but *unimportant* they were not. By this letter the intentions of Mr Smith to destroy the influence of men who were every way his superiors, morally, intellectually, politically his superiors, was made manifest. I was not requested to keep this information secret by the person who had placed the letter in my hands; and I did what I shall ever deem it my duty to do: I put men of worth on their guard against the malignant designs of ———; but I resolved when I began this letter to use no harsh epithet, and I will not suffer one to escape me.

If, however, any person had reason to complain, it was the gentleman through whom the information was obtained. With him, however I have ever continued upon the most friendly terms. Our intimacy was never greater than at this moment, and I feel proud to avow its existence, for I esteem his character. I love the frankness, the cordiality, and the independence by which he is distinguished: I respect his freedom from intrigue, and his detestation of the low and vile arts, by which political fortune hunters endeavour to rise. When Cumberland was represented in Congress, by him, that dis-

trict might well be distinguished as "*the Star in the East.*" In comparison with what it then was what is it now but "*a little farthing rush light?*"

But Mr Smith himself did not think that he had a right to question my conduct. At that time I did not know the man by sight, and certainly there was nothing, which had come to my knowledge, respecting him, which excited in me any inclination to become acquainted with him. After his election to congress he was casually introduced to me and invited me to visit him. If he had thought that he had sufficient cause of offence, he would not have suffered his call for explanation to slumber for three years, nor would he, at the expiration of that time, have rather sought than declined my acquaintance. I correct myself: I mean to say, that such would not have been the course of any one endowed with those feelings which cause a man to pass through life with respect.

I have but one more observation to make, upon Mr Smith's pamphlet. He closes it with a letter purporting to have been sent by him to me to which he has appended the following note:

["The foregoing letter was retained only a short time by Mr Jarvis, and then returned to me, through the P. O. which was the channel of all the preceding communications between us. F. O. J. S."]

From the tenor of this note it is obvious that he intended to create, in your minds the impression that the contents of this letter were known to me, though he has not the hardihood to assert it. Fellow citizens, what must be your feelings towards this man when I declare to you that of the contents of this letter I was utterly ignorant, until I saw them in the printed pamphlet of Mr Smith? After I had in my last note declined all correspondence with him, excepting what might pass through the intervention of mutual friends, Mr Smith was not ashamed to send me another letter through the Post Office which I did not open and which I retained no longer than was necessary to put it under a blank cover, and throw it again into the Post Office, from which I had received it. He must have known if this be indeed the letter which I returned to him, that he was doubly safe in writing it. He must have known that I could adopt no other course than to return it unopened, after my distinct declaration

to him, and that, if by any accident, its contents should become known to me, my contempt for any one who would after my proffer have degraded himself by writing such a letter, would effectually shield him from any further notice on my part.

Fellow Citizens: I have now said all that I think the occasion calls for. I have endeavored out of respect to you—to the body of which Mr Smith is a member, and to the district which he represents, to abstain from the use of harsh and injurious epithets. If, after a perusal of his pamphlet, and of my reply, you think he has entitled himself to the degrading and withering epithets by which we mark our contempt of what is abject, and our detestation of what is vile, I leave it to you to apply them.

LEONARD JARVIS.

Washington, Dec. 1834.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr Francis O. J. Smith having caused to be placed upon the tables of the members of the House, a gross and infamous attack upon the character of one of his colleagues, it becomes necessary that the subsequent proceedings resulting from this act, should also be known.

Mr Jarvis therefore submits the correspondence which has taken place, and pronounces Francis O. J. Smith to be, most emphatically, a LIAR, a SCOUNDREL, and a COWARD.

[Mr Lytle to Mr Jarvis.]

Washington, January 10th, 1835.

DEAR SIR—I herewith return you a copy of the correspondence between yourself, myself, and Francis O. J. Smith, Esq., together with a letter from my friend, the Hon. James Love, of Kentucky.—I consider that the course of Mr Smith is such as to entitle him to no further notice on your part, unless, it might be to spread this correspondence before the public: and thereby, place him in the attitude which that publication must entitle him to, in the estimation of every just and honorable mind.

It is not for me to force or invite unnecessarily a contest with Mr Smith. He has chosen to place himself out of my reach as your friend—and in no other way have I any claim for satisfaction on him. I leave him, therefore, and his communications, with you to dispose of, as may seem best in your own judgment.

I am, most respectfully, your obedient servant,

HON. LEONARD JARVIS.

— R. T. LYTLE.

[Letter from Mr Jarvis to Mr Smith.]

Washington, Friday, February 6th, 1835.

SIR—A printed document to which your name is affixed, has this morning been laid upon my table, in the House of Representatives, as well as upon that of other members, reflecting upon my character, in terms too gross for me to repeat. No man has a right to use the language that you have permitted yourself to use—unless, he is willing to hold himself personally responsible. I am, therefore willing to assume, that you are ready to give me the satisfaction which, in such cases, the injured party has a right to demand; and which, the person who gives the provocation, cannot refuse, unless he is willing to submit to the scorn of every man endowed with honorable feelings. My regard for the character of the State, of which we both are citizens, and which, we in part, represent—induces me to afford you an opportunity of showing, that in your attack upon me, there is something more than mere bravado. My friend, Mr Lytle, who does me the honor to be the bearer of this message, will arrange with any friend of yours, whom you may indicate, the time, the place, and other preliminaries of our meeting.

MR FRANCIS O. J. SMITH.

LEONARD JARVIS

[*Mr Smith to Mr Lytle.*]

Hon. R. T. Lytle,

Washington, February 7th, 1835.

SIR:—Only out of respect for yourself, I consented this morning to receive from you, a communication addressed to me, signed Leonard Jarvis, and dated yesterday, in which he affects to regard myself, as having commenced an “attack” upon his character, and to require of me “the satisfaction that in such cases the injured party has a right to demand.”

Apart from the misrepresentation in his letter, that I had stood in relation to him, otherwise than upon the defensive, against his own base intrigues to injure myself, I should be paying to my own self-respect, but a poor compliment, were I to permit myself to answer such a call from a man, who, before having recourse to his present expedient for satisfaction, not only suffered himself to be *suspected*, but to be *convicted*, in addition thereto, in two instances at least, of acts of piracy upon my confidential correspondence, such as no one, entitled to the distinction of an *honorable* man, would, or could commit.

In addition to this, you should understand that, before he made his appeal to the public press, to sustain his own character, and to detract from mine, he knew, (from my letter to him of the 17th of March last,) that I held myself responsible to him, personally, in any ordeal he might select, for either the further prosecution, or immediate termination of his controversy with me. *Then*, he stood only in the position of one *suspected* of dishonorable conduct, and had the claims of one thus situated. But, not being disposed to improve the ordeal that he now tenders, he elected an appeal to the judgments of his and my fellow citizens, through the public press, and this after my letter of the 17th of March had been made public, so that he could not be ignorant of its contents. At that tribunal of his choice, *I have met him*: And if he has failed of obtaining satisfaction *there*, it is because his position has been changed from that of a man only *suspected*, to that of one positively *convicted*, of acts which degrade him below my respect, and convert him into game, not worth my pursuit, even for purposes of retaliation. He well understood this, or he would probably have again relieved his *valor*, by an appeal to the public, as he did in the former instance, instead of troubling you, to be the bearer of any communication to me.

Permit me to add, as my own notions of what is just, that the man, whose inward sense of honor and shame, cannot be disturbed by implications of the character complained of by Mr Jarvis, until the pain of blows, inflicted publicly, in the shape of proofs of the justness of those implications, has made him desperate, ceases to have a claim to the protection of *any code of honor*, and much less of such a code as, in its nature, secures the man who can pocket what he conceives to be an insult, if it be given *in private*, and who recoils only when the public are put in the way, upon his own appeal, of pronouncing it *merited*.

Very nearly, in the language of another, fully indicative of the feelings I now entertain towards him, and of the feelings that, in view of the course he has pursued, will more redound to "the character of the State," which he affects to have at heart, I will conclude.

I know not what sense of punishment may reach the soul of ribalds, such as Jarvis—but if his insults sink no deeper in the minds of the inquisitors, than they can *now* in mine, he will, for all acquittance, be left to his own shamelessness and shame.

Disclaiming all intentional disrespect towards yourself, allow me to add assurances of the sentiments of esteem, with which

I have the honor to be, your obedient servant,

FRANCIS O. J. SMITH.

[*Mr Lytle to Mr Smith.*]

Hon. F. O. J. Smith,

Washington, Feb. 7th 1835.

SIR:—I have read the letter you just now left with me of this date; but which I was not permitted to do, before you departed.

Allow me to say, that I did not expect a revised history of your controversy or correspondence with Mr. Jarvis, when I became the bearer of his letter to you, of this morning, but a *direct*, unequivocal, and brief reply to the demand of *my friend*, for reparation to his injured character, and wounded honor.

I shall not receive your communication of to-night, as an answer suitable to be borne by me, to my friend, but shall expect one of that character, as promptly as it may conveniently be given.

Respectfully, sir, your obedient servant, R. T. LYTLE.

P. S. I herewith return your communication.

[*Mr. Smith to Mr Lytle.*]

Hon. R. T. Lytle,

Washington, Feb. 9th 1835.

SIR:—I have read the note from yourself, which you handed me late on Saturday night last; but which I was not permitted to do before you departed.

I have made you acquainted with the relationship in which I stand to Mr Jarvis, and shall take no further notice of his note to me, in way of reply.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

FRANCIS O. J. SMITH.

[*Mr Lytle to Mr Smith.*]

Washington, February 9th, 1835.

SIR:—In your communication of this morning, handed me by Major Hall, I find the following remark, viz:—"I have made you acquainted with the relationship in which I stand to Mr Jarvis, and shall take no further notice of *his* note to me in way of reply."

If this remark, taken in connection with the abusive epithets you thought proper to apply to Mr Jarvis, in your letter to me of the 7th inst. you mean to intimate that I am to be regarded as the organ of a demand for satisfaction, from one who is not to be considered as a gentleman, and that you would *prefer*, in the adjustment of this diffi-

culty, the *bearer* of his communication, I am happy to inform you, that from my knowledge of Mr Jarvis as a man of honor and integrity, I am prepared to sustain him throughout, and you may consider me as his endorser, and if you prefer a settlement of this controversy through me, my friend who bears this, is authorised to adjust with you, or any friend of yours, the terms usual on such occasions.

Your obedient servant,

R. T. LYTLE.

[*Mr Love to Mr Lytle.*]

Washington, Feb. 9, 1835.

DEAR SIR—I handed your note to Mr Smith this morning: he disclaimed, in express terms, any intentions of disrespect to you in his notes to Mr Jarvis, that he had no cause of quarrel with you, and would have none in relation to this business.

I asked him, if he had any objections to commit to writing, this disclaimer. He answered that he had no wish to enter into a correspondence on this subject, that if his note should be considered as disrespectful, he would at any time make the disclaimer. I consider the answer of Mr Smith as satisfactory.

Hon. R. T. LYTLE.

Your friend,

JAMES LOVE.

[*Mr Jarvis to Mr Lytle.*]

Washington, Feb. 10th, 1835.

DEAR SIR—I find, by the copy of the very scurrilous, contemptible and cowardly note of F. O. J. Smith, which is among the papers you have handed me to-day, that he shrinks from a personal interview with me, under the pretence that I was bound to notice a former abusive note from him, which he sent to me, after I had offered him personal satisfaction, and which I returned to him unopened.

As I had the advantage of your counsel, will you do me the favor to state, whether the course adopted by me, did, or did not, comport with your views of what was due to myself, upon that occasion.

Very faithfully, your obedient servant,

LEONARD JARVIS.

HON. R. T. LYTLE.

[*Mr Lytle to Mr Jarvis.*]

DEAR SIR—I have received your note of the 10th, enquiring from me, whether the course adopted by you “did or did not comport with your (my) views of what was due to yourself?” upon the occasion of your controversy with Mr Smith:

I have no hesitation in saying, that from the period of your application to me, in relation to this affair, the course you adopted *did comport* with my views of propriety, in all respects. My own note to Mr Smith is the best proof I can offer you, as to the estimation in which I hold your course and character.

With great respect, your friend, and obedient servant,

HON. LEONARD JARVIS.

ROBERT T. LYTLE.

Washington, Feb. 11, 1835.



WERT BOOKBINDING

JAN 1989

Grantville, PA

